C12-02905 JSC

1 2	JAMES V. FITZGERALD, III (State Bar No. 55632) PETRA BRUGGISSER (State Bar No. 241173) NOAH G. BLECHMAN (State Bar No. 197167) McNamara, Ney, Beatty, Slattery,		
3	BORGES & AMBACHER LLP 1211 Newell Avenue		
4	Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 939-5330		
5	Facsimile: (925) 939-0203		
6 7	Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF SAN PABLO, OFFICER MARK GALIOS		
8	Edi M. O. Faal, Esq. State Bar No.: 107477 Renée L. Campbell, Esq. State Bar No.: 1040 LAW OFFICES OF EDI M. O. FAAL	020	
10	1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 2140 Los Angeles, California 90017		
11	Telephone: (213) 534-0344 Facsimile: (213) 534-0347		
12	e-Mail Address: reneecampbell.law@gmail.com		
13	Attorney for Plaintiffs RHONDA MINTER GUARDIAN AD LITEM FOR ISAIAH MINTER; IMANI MINTER; JAYSHON HOPKINS; AHMIK HOPKINS-MINTER		
14			
15	LINUTED OT A TEC DICTRICT COLUDT		
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18		G N G12 02005 19G	
19	RHONDA MINTER GUARDIAN AD LITEM FOR ISAIAH MINTER; IMANI	Case No. C12-02905 JSC	
20	MINTER;JAYSHON BROOKS; AHMIK HOPKINS-MINTER ARI; ZION	STIPULATION AND <del>PROPOSED</del> ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS LEAVE TO	
21	HOPKINS-MINTER,	FILE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT	
22	Plaintiff,		
23	VS.		
24 25	CITY OF SAN PABLO; POLICE OFFICER MARK EDWARD GALIOS; DOES 1 through X,		
26	Defendant.		
27			
28			

## 

#### 

### 

# 

## 

### 

#### 

### 

#### 

### 

#### 

# 

## 

# 

#### TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

**WHEREAS,** Defendants previously filed a Rule 12 motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint which was granted by the Court on October 26, 2012, with leave to amend;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs have timely filed a First Amended Complaint;

WHEREAS, Defendants contend that the First Amended Complaint is still deficient because it includes claims that are barred as a matter of law, including state law claims (negligence) on behalf of the minor Plaintiffs that are barred by California Government Code §§ 945.4 and 950.2, as well as non-viable 42 U.S.C. § 1983 federal claims for alleged excessive force under the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment in the Second Cause of Action, by the minor Plaintiffs on behalf of the Decedent as his successor in interest;

**WHEREAS,** Defense counsel contacted Plaintiffs' counsel in a good faith attempt to meet and confer on the deficient claims. Plaintiffs' counsel has agreed to strike the negligence state law claim (paragraphs 26 through 30) in its entirety, as well as the claims for excessive force in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment under (42 U.S.C. § 1983), specifically as stated in paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint;

**WHEREAS**, the parties have agreed in the interest of judicial economy to stipulate to grant leave to the Plaintiffs to file a Second Amended Complaint without the deficient claims, in lieu of Defendants having to file another Rule 12 motion to dismiss that claim;

**NOW THEREFORE** the parties hereby agree and stipulate to allow Plaintiffs to file a Second Amended Complaint without the state law negligence claim and without the claims for excessive force in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment under (42 U.S.C. § 1983), as currently plead in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (paragraphs 17, 26 through 30).

#### SO STIPULATED.

///

1	Dated: December 6, 2012	LAW OFFICES OF EDI M. O. FAAL
2		Dyu /a/ Danca I. Camphall
3		By: /s/ Renee L. Campbell Renée L. Campbell
4		Attorney for Plaintiffs
5		
5	Dated: December 6, 2012	MC NAMARA, NEY, BEATTY, SLATTERY, BORGES & AMABACHER LLP
7		W THAT IS TETLEN ELL
8		
9		By:/s/ James V. Fitzgerald, III
0		James V. Fitzgerald, III, Esq. Petra Bruggisser, Esq.
1		Attorney for Defendants
2		
3		
4		
5		
7		
8		
9		
)		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		

#### [PROPOSED] ORDER

#### PURSUANT TO THE PARTIES' STIPULATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The Plaintiffs are granted leave to file a Second Amended Complaint. The Second Amended Complaint shall not contain any state law negligence claim and shall not contain any claims for excessive force in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by the minor Plaintiffs on behalf of the decedent as his successor in interest.

#### IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 7, 2012

By:

Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley

Magistrate Judge of the District Court